

CEQA/NEPA DOCUMENTATION & SPECIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES Evaluation Criteria/Selection Process Summary

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was divided into two work categories:

Category 1) professional services in the preparation of CEQA/NEPA documents and special environmental studies, and

Category 2) professional services in the preparation of special environmental studies including, but not limited to: cultural resources; air quality, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gases; and NEPA documentation and peer review.

Firms were able to propose on Category 1 or Category 2. Proposals were rated based on the criteria in the Selection Evaluation Form included in this transmittal. Twenty-two proposals were received for Category 1 and eight proposals were received for Category 2. One proposal under Category 1 was disqualified because they did not meet the administrative requirements.

Proposals Received

	COMPANY	CATEGORY	STATUS	CITY, ST
1	AECOM	1	OBE	Los Angeles, CA
2	AMEC Earth & Environmental, Inc.	1	OBE	Newport Beach, CA
3	Aspen Environmental Group	1	OBE	Agoura Hills, CA
4	Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.	1	OBE	Los Angeles, CA
5	CH2MHill	1	OBE	Santa Ana, CA
6	Christopher A. Joseph & Associates	1	SBE	Los Angeles, CA
7	Environ	1	OBE	Los Angeles, CA
8	ESA	1	OBE	Los Angeles, CA
9	GPA Environmental Services	1	SBE, WBE	Redondo Beach, CA
10	Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.	1	OBE	Irvine, CA
11	Impact Sciences	1	SBE	Pasadena, CA
12	LSA	1	OBE	Irvine, CA
13	PMC (Pacific Municipal Consultants)	1	SBE, WBE	Torrance, CA
14	Parsons	1	OBE	Pasadena, CA
15	The Planning Center	1	OBE	Los Angeles, CA
16	The Planning Consortium, Inc.	1	OBE	Orange, CA
17	RBF	1	SBE, MBE	Ontario, CA
18	Rincon	1	SBE	Ventura, CA
19	SAIC (Sciense Application Intl. Corp.)	1	OBE	San Diego, CA
20	Sapphos Environmental, Inc.	1	SBE, MBE,WBE	Pasadena, CA
21	Tetra Tech, Inc.	1	OBE	Pasadena, CA
22	TRC Solutions, Inc.	1	OBE	Irvine, CA
23	AFSHA Consulting	2	SBE, WBE	Irvine, CA
24	ASM Affiliates	2	SBE	Pasadena, CA
25	Jacobs	2	OBE	Los Angeles, CA
26	Michael Brandman Associates	2	OBE	Irvine, CA
27	Castle Environmental Consulting, LLC	2	SBE	Los Angeles, CA
28	Starcrest	2	SBE	Chino Hills, CA
29	Terry A. Hayes Associates, LLC	2	SBE, MBE	Culver City, CA
30	Secured Environment	2	SBE, MBE	Mountain View, CA

Proposal Review Results

Proposals were individually reviewed and scored using a range of 0 to 5 for each criteria, with 5 being exceptionally well qualified and 0 being not included/non-responsive. A weighting factor and weighted score were not used for the proposal review process, so the maximum rater score is 25. This is shown on the attached RFP Selection Evaluation Form. The ranked results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Proposal Review Scores

Firm	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Total Score (Max Points 50)
Category 1			
Jones & Stokes	24	25	49
SAIC	24	25	49
Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.	23	24	47
Environ	23	24	47
CH2MHill	23	24	47
AECOM	23	24	47
ESA	20	22	42
Tetra Tech, Inc.	20	20	40
Parsons	20	22	42
TRC Solutions, Inc.	19	20	39
Firm A.P	14	14	28
Firm B.P	14	13	27
Firm C.P	15	14	29
Firm D.P	15	14	29
Firm E.P	14	12	26
Firm F.P	13	12	25
Firm G.P	13	12	25
Firm H.P	13	12	25
Firm I.P	12	10	22
Firm J.P	10	9	19
Firm K.P	9	10	19
Category 2			
Castle Environmental Consulting, LLC	25	25	50
Starcrest	24	25	49
Michael Brandman Associates	20	20	40
Jacobs	20	20	40
Firm L.P	13	12	25
Firm M.P	13	12	25
Firm N.P	13	10	23
Firm O.P	13	9	22

Interview Selection

Based on the Proposal Review scores above, the following 10 firms under Category 1 and four firms under Category 2 were invited to interview (qualifying with a score of 30 points (60%) or higher):

Category 1

AECOM
Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.
CH2MHill
Environ
ESA
Jones & Stokes
Parsons
SAIC
Tetra Tech, Inc.
TRC Solutions, Inc.

Category 2

Castle Environmental Consulting, LLC
Jacobs
Michael Brandman Associates
Starcrest

Interview Results

All firms listed above were interviewed. During the interview process, each firm responded to a set of questions formulated by the interview panel. The firms were ranked based on the results of their presentations and responses, using the criteria shown on the Interview Selection Evaluation Form.

Each criteria was scored using a range of 0 to 5, with 5 being exceptionally well qualified and 0 being not included/non-responsive. A weighting factor was established for each criteria and a final weighted score was calculated with a maximum score of 100. As can be seen on the Interview Selection Evaluation Form, Firm Qualifications & Experience (30%) and Project Organization & Personnel (30%) were assigned the highest weighting, followed by Technical Approach (20%), Fees & Budget Control (10%) and Quality & Responsiveness of Proposal (10%). The results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Interview Scores

Firm	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Total Score
Category 1					
Environ	98	98	96	98	390
Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.	98	98	92	96	384
SAIC	98	98	89	98	383
Jones & Stokes	98	98	88	98	382
AECOM	92	96	85	98	371
Firm A.I	88	90	86	78	342
Firm B.I	88	90	80	82	340
Firm C.I	80	78	80	76	314
Firm D.I	80	82	70	78	310
Firm E.I	72	67	76	64	279
Category 2					
Castle Env. Consulting, LLC	98	100	97	98	393
Starcrest	93	90	96	98	377
Firm F.I	73	70	70	74	287
Firm G.I	70	62	62	62	256

Firm Selection

Based on the interviews conducted, five firms under Category 1 and two firms under Category 2 were selected as the most qualified to meet the Port's anticipated needs over the next three years. The seven firms were determined to be the appropriate number of firms to handle current and forecasted environmental assessment projects. The recommended firms include:

Category 1

AECOM

Camp Dresser & McKee Inc.

Environ

Jones & Stokes

SAIC

Category 2

Castle Environmental Consulting, LLC

Starcrest

RFP SELECTION EVALUATION FORM

PROJECT: CEQA/NEPA DOCUMENTATION AND SPECIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

SCORING GUIDELINES:

Rater's Score: (Range 0-5) - 0=not included/non responsive; 1=Marginal Abilities, Serious Deficiencies; 2=Adequate with Minor Deficiencies; 3=Adequate, Standard-Acceptable; 4=Well Qualified; 5=Exceptionally Well Qualified.

Total score = Sum of all Rater's scores.

Firm Name	Evaluated by	Date

CRITERIA TO BE RATED		RATER'S SCORE
A. Firm Qualifications, Experience and References	How long has the company been in business? Has the company done similar work (ports, law enforcement and operations)? Level of expertise in subject matters areas?	
B. Project Organization, Personnel and Staffing	Qualification and experience of proposed personnel for requested services. On-site availability of team and project manager? Locally based firm or team? Clear organization chart provided?	
C. Technical Approach	Does the consultant understand the Scope of Work? Documents a knowledgeable, logical, technical approach for providing required services? Describe how the consultant intends to perform the required services?	
D. Rates, Fees and Budget Control	Competitive rates and fees proposed? Are proposed budget management, fees and staff hours proposed and clearly defined?	
E. Quality and Responsiveness of the Proposal	Is the proposal clear and understandable; does the proposal responsive to the Port's RFP and meet all of the RFP requirements?	
	Maximum points possible=25	Total Points=

INTERVIEW SELECTION EVALUATION FORM

PROJECT: CEQA/NEPA DOCUMENTATION AND SPECIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

SCORING GUIDELINES:

Rater's Score: (Range 0-5) - 0=not included/non responsive; 1=Marginal Abilities, Serious Deficiencies; 2=Adequate with Minor Deficiencies; 3=Adequate, Standard-Acceptable; 4=Well Qualified; 5=Exceptionally Well Qualified.

Weighting Factor: Input using a range of 1 through 6, with 1 being of relative lower importance and 6 being relative highest importance. You may use each number (1 through 5) more than once; however, in establishing weights, the total of all the weighing factors (A –E) must equal 20. Example: 3+2+6+4+5=20 or 3+3+3+6+5=20

Weighted Score= Rater's Score multiplied by (x) Weighting Factor. Totals should be calculated for each criterion.

Total score = Sum of all weighted scores.

Firm Name	Evaluated by	Date

CRITERIA TO BE RATED		RATER'S SCORE	WEIGHING FACTOR	WEIGHTED SCORE
A. Firm Qualifications, Experience and References	How long has the company been in business? Has the company done similar work (ports, law enforcement and operations)? Level of expertise in subject matters areas?		6	
B. Project Organization, Personnel and Staffing	Qualification and experience of proposed personnel for requested services. On-site availability of team and project manager? Locally based firm or team? Clear organization chart provided?		6	
C. Technical Approach	Does the consultant understand the Scope of Work? Documents a knowledgeable, logical, technical approach for providing required services? Describe how the consultant intends to perform the required services?		4	
D. Rates, Fees and Budget Control	Competitive rates and fees proposed? Are proposed budget management, fees and staff hours proposed and clearly defined?		2	
E. Quality and Responsiveness of the Proposal	Is the proposal clear and understandable; does the proposal responsive to the Port's RFP and meet all of the RFP requirements?		2	
	Maximum points possible=100		A+B+C+D+E=20	Total Points=